

**Strategic Prevention Framework State Incentive Grant
(SPF SIG)
Evaluation Workgroup Meeting
October 24th, 2006**

ATTENDEES: Bob Levy, Jeff Barber, Eric Wright, Harold Kooreman, Chandana Saba, Ruth Gassman, Rebecca Smith, Marcia French, and Gary Williams.

WELCOME

Bob Levy opened and welcomed all to the meeting.

Approval of Minutes (9/26/06)

A review of the past meeting's minutes was done and a motion to approve them was given. The motion was sustained unanimously.

STAFFING REPORT:

Introduction of Ruth Gassman, from the PRC, to the Workgroup. Chandana Saba was observing as a new member to Eric Wright's team. A short discussion was had about whether Ruth was the appropriate representative from the PRC and it was agreed upon that she could provide an overall picture and that later down the road we may choose to include Eric Vance Martin, but that his skills would be better served in the Training and Outreach Workgroup.

UPDATE REPORT

Evaluation planning for Work Plan

A discussion ensued about the focus of the Evaluation Workgroup being inclusive of national, state, community, and process evaluation. The evaluations are to be centered on serving as a real time assessment with the feedback being used to drive the processes.

Evaluation Survey Document

The evaluation survey was distributed which had been condensed to a one page document-front and back. Concerns were discussed about it being weighted toward positive responses. Discussion about having a neutral response being added was brought up as well as adding a 'very poor' category. Agreement was made to take off the 'Don't know' category and add 'very poor'. It was also decided to change all references from the SAC to GAC to reflect the name change, to replace the word subcommittee to Workgroup/Committee, change the SAC Support staff category to the SEOW, and add Visitor to the Community Partner/Representative category. Another category will be added: 'Opportunity for me to provide input', to the second half of the front page. The back, on the top half will be condensed to one area labeled 'Comments-most helpful, least helpful, areas of improvement & topics you would like more information or training on'. The bottom portion of the back page will add bullets for sub-categories of each step and a thank you added to the end of the document. At the beginning of the survey a disclaimer and intro will be added. Concerns of the document being too long were explored and an agreement to use it for a few meetings and then the workgroup will do a re-evaluation of the document.

The SAC (State Advisory Council) will now be referred to as the GAC (Governor's Advisory Council).

UPDATES

Observations and concerns were expressed about the previous GAC meeting. Specific areas of concern discussed were:

Seating configuration not being conducive to bldg. team and trust
Meeting Processes: lack of introductions and agency affiliation
Concerns regarding Council and Executive Committee member absences
No venue for the Council members to be heard
Agenda not being reviewed
High level of frustration with questions/no dialogue/shutting down comments by not addressing and responding to them
How the vice chair was chosen and lack of introduction for him
Members not being vested in project and just wanting to get out of meeting
Side bar conversations
Need for more direction from Chair

Suggestions:

Closing the square more so people aren't so far apart/smaller room
Introductions at the beginning of every meeting with ground rules specifically stated
Clarify the role of the Vice Chair when Chair is unable to attend
Adding Parking lot for people to bring up topics of concern
Review agenda topics
Use a facilitator to engage the Council in conversation and decision making

The concerns were discussed at length, possible alternatives to address concerns explored and the need for issues to be brought to the executive committee at that afternoon's meeting. A desire to have the issues acknowledged and what will be done to address and rectify the concerns was voiced. Also a need to identify goals and state purposes of meetings before the meeting along with the line of authority and decision making processes to be explained in emails to assist members of the Council in serving a stronger support to the project and serving as their role in the decision making body of the project. A graph of the SPF SIG process and sectors would also be of great benefit to the Councils.

Evaluation Planning Documents and Report on from the evaluation meeting in MD

Eric Wright talked briefly about the convention in MD on evaluation. He suggested in the interest of time that he give a brief overview and then next month speak in more detail. He mentioned the 4 levels of focus: Federal, State, community and process evaluation. He also mentioned the communities need for evaluation at their level with the funding being provided from the dollars of the awarded monies. An acknowledgement that each site will be developing a specific set of tools to measure outcome which the Evaluation Team will assist with was noted. The role of Eric and his team will be more of a mentorship than one of a project directorship. The state will review and offer input on the community's evaluation processes. Partnerships are being considered within the evaluation processes too.

Next Meeting Focuses:

A final draft of the evaluation survey will be reviewed to take to the Council for approval. Review of the Exec. Meeting where concerns were shared from the evaluation workgroup.

MEETING SCHEDULE

The next meeting will be November 21st, at 10:30 am.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned by the Chair.